



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2017

---

**Demosthenes and (late) ancient miniature books from Egypt: reflections on  
a category, physical features, purpose and use**

Kraus, Thomas J.

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-142818>

Book Section

Published Version

Originally published at:

Kraus, Thomas J. (2017). Demosthenes and (late) ancient miniature books from Egypt: reflections on a category, physical features, purpose and use. In: Arcari, Luca. Beyond conflicts: religious and cultural cohabitations in Alexandria and in Egypt between the 1st and the 6th century CE. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 115-130.

# Beyond Conflicts

Cultural and Religious Cohabitations  
in Alexandria and Egypt between the 1st  
and the 6th Century CE

edited by

Luca Arcari

Mohr Siebeck

E-Offprint of the Author with Publisher's Permission

LUCA ARCARI, born 1977; 2005 PhD in Ancient History; 2007–2012 Post-Doctoral Researcher at the University of Naples Federico II, the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, and the “Michele Pellegrino” Foundation (University of Turin); currently Assistant Professor of History of Ancient Christianity and History of Religions at the University of Naples Federico II.

ISBN 978-3-16-155144-4

ISSN 1436-3003 (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2017 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

E-Offprint of the Author with Publisher's Permission

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .....	V
Abbreviations .....	XI

## *Introduction*

*Luca Arcari*

Cultural and Religious Cohabitations in Alexandria and Egypt between the 1st and the 6th Cent. CE .....	1
---	---

## *Part One*

### *Use, (Re-)Invention and (Re-)Definition of Discursive Practices*

*Tobias Nicklas*

Jewish, Christian, Greek? The Apocalypse of Peter as a Witness of Early 2nd-Cent. Christianity in Alexandria .....	27
--	----

*Philippe Matthey*

The Once and Future King of Egypt: Egyptian “Messianism” and the Construction of the Alexander Romance .....	47
--	----

*Antonio Sena*

Demonology between Celsus and Origen: A Theoretical Model of Religious Cohabitation? .....	73
--	----

*Daniele Tripaldi*

“Basilides” and “the Egyptian Wisdom:” Some Remarks on a Peculiar Heresiological Notice (Ps.-Hipp. <i>Haer.</i> 7.20–27) .....	87
--	----

*Thomas J. Kraus*

Demosthenes and (Late) Ancient Miniature Books from Egypt: Reflections on a Category, Physical Features, Purpose and Use .....	115
--	-----

*Paola Buzi*

Remains of Gnomic Anthologies and Pagan Wisdom Literature in the Coptic Tradition .....	131
---	-----

*Part Two*  
*Ideological Debates as Images of Cultural  
 and Religious Cohabitations*

*Bernard Pouderon*

“Jewish,” “Christian” and “Gnostic” Groups in Alexandria during  
 the 2nd Cent.: Between Approval and Expulsion ..... 155

*Adele Monaci Castagno*

Messengers from Heaven: Divine Men and God’s Men in the Alexandrian  
 Platonism (2nd–4th Cent.)..... 177

*Mark J. Edwards*

Late Antique Alexandria and the “Orient” ..... 195

*Ewa Wipszycka*

How Insurmountable was the Chasm between Monophysites and  
 Chalcedonians?..... 207

*Philippe Blaudeau*

*Vel si non tibi communicamus, tamen amamus te.* Remarques sur  
 la description par Liberatus de Carthage des rapports entre Miaphysites  
 et Chalcédoniens à Alexandrie (milieu V<sup>e</sup>–milieu VI<sup>e</sup> s.) ..... 227

*Part Three*  
*Cults and Practices as Spaces for Encounters and Interactions*

*Sofia Torallas Tovar*

Love and Hate? Again on Dionysos in the Eyes of the Alexandrian Jews .. 247

*Francesco Massa*

Devotees of Serapis and Christ? A Literary Representation of Religious  
 Cohabitations in the 4th Cent. .... 263

*Mariangela Monaca*

Between Cyril and Isis: Some Remarks on the Iatromantic Cults  
 in 5th-Cent. Alexandria..... 283

*Part Four*  
*“Open” and “Closed” Groups*

*Marie-Françoise Baslez*

Open-air Festivals and Cultural Cohabitation in Late Hellenistic Alexandria .....	307
---	-----

*Livia Capponi*

The Common Roots of Egyptians and Jews: Life and Meaning of an Ancient Stereotype .....	323
---	-----

*Hugo Lundhaug*

The Nag Hammadi Codices in the Complex World of 4th- and 5th-Cent. Egypt .....	339
--	-----

*Part Five*  
*The Construction of Authority in Philosophical  
and Religious Schools*

*Carmine Pisano*

Moses “Prophet” of God in the Works of Philo, or How to Use <i>Otherness</i> to Construct <i>Selfness</i> .....	361
---	-----

*Giulia Sfameni Gasparro*

Alexandria in the Mirror of Origen’s <i>didaskaleion</i> : Between the Great Church, Heretics and Philosophers.....	377
---	-----

*Marco Rizzi*

Cultural and Religious Exchanges in Alexandria: The Transformation of Philosophy and Exegesis in the 3rd Cent. in the Mirror of Origen.....	399
---	-----

Index of Ancient Sources.....	415
-------------------------------	-----

Index of Modern Authors .....	439
-------------------------------	-----

Index of Main Topics.....	453
---------------------------	-----

List of Contributors .....	459
----------------------------	-----

# Demosthenes and (Late) Ancient Miniature Books from Egypt

## Reflections on a Category, Physical Features, Purpose and Use

*Thomas J. Kraus*

### 1. Introduction

Today we are used to the lending or sharing of books, to recommend titles and give them to others, and to go to libraries or even order books from someone else. Even in times of the Internet, of easy and sometimes permanent availability of information and literature, this common practice has not really stopped. Books are still there and books are still read, though new formats may have altered their individual handling and use, if we just fancy e-books and complete books accessible on the Internet. Also small formats of books are still there, and this not only as collectibles for bibliophiles<sup>1</sup> or paperbacks of standard literature;<sup>2</sup> and this is not an innovation of modern times. Small books have already had an impressively long history. For quite some time the word “book” has been associated with a codex, but in (late) antiquity also the roll served as the standard format of documents, for literary texts, and for diverse purposes of writing. The major materials were papyrus, parchment, and wood, the latter, of course, as a prototype or model of the codex.<sup>3</sup> And this is also the case for the “small” books in (late) antiquity. But one by one and let us not put the cart before the horse.

On the recto of a private letter from the second half of the 5th cent. CE (P.Berol. 21849 = SB 12.11084 = C.Pap.Hengstl 91) a certain Victor writes to a certain Theognostus as follows:<sup>4</sup>

Τῷ κυρίῳ μο[υ]

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information see Kraus 2010: 79–81; Kraus forthcoming: “Introduction.”

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, the *Universal-Bibliothek*, the fixed standard paperbacks (9.5cm wide and 14.8 cm high) of the German publishing house Philipp Reclam jun. GmbH in Stuttgart (<http://www.reclam.de>; last access 01/09/2015).

<sup>3</sup> For further information see Kraus 2010: 84–85.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. transcription and notes are dependent on the first edition by Maehler 1974 (images of recto and verso on pl. 10 between pages 310 and 311), and Hengstl 1978: no. 91 (227–229).

- ἐναρέτω ἀδελφῷ [Θεογνώστῳ]  
 Βικτωρ χ(αίρειν).  
 Κατα[ξι]οῦτω ἡ σὴ λογιότης διδόναι Ἡλία  
 5 π[.]υλῶ τῷ παιδί τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ γραμματι-  
 κοῦ τὸ βιβλίον ὅπερ δέδωκα τῇ σῇ ἀ-  
 δελφότητι τυγχάνοντι ἐπὶ τῆς Ἑρμούπο-  
 λιτῶν· οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ θεός, ἀναγκάζομαι {α}  
 οὐχ ὥς ἔτυχεν / ἔστιν δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου Κλαυ-  
 10 δίου τῷ<sup>5</sup>[ν ὑπ(ομνημάτων)]<sup>6</sup> εἰς Δημοσθένην τὸν ῥήτορ[α τὸ (πρῶτον)]<sup>7</sup>  
 [καί]<sup>8</sup> Μενάνδρου τέχνην ἐν τάχ[ι. . . .]

And then he continues on the verso, first across the fibres and in the lefthand corner of the papyrus,

καὶ μεθόδους  
 καὶ ἐγκώμια  
 ἐν τάχ[ει ]

and then with the fibres, roughly in the middle of the fragment:

Ὑπομνηστικὸν πρ(ὸς) Θεόγνω-  
 στον π(αρά) Βίκτορ(ος)

In English the letter reads as follows:<sup>9</sup>

(*recto*) To my lord and virtuous brother Theognostus, greetings (from) Victor. May your eloquence deign to give Elias P. ylus (?), the school master's slave, the book which I gave your brotherliness when you were in Hermupolis – for God knows, I am in direct need – namely (the commentary) on the orator Demosthenes by Alexander Claudius . . . . (and) Menander's "Art," quickly (*verso*) and the "Methods" and the "Eulogies," quickly.  
 (*address*) "Reminder to Theognostus from Victor"

The letter found at Hermopolis (= Hermopolis Magna between Upper and Lower Egypt) on January 5, 1905, represents a friendly, succinct, and slightly enthusiastic reminder for Theognostos to return a book he borrowed from Victor in Hermopolis. Moreover, Victor adds the name of the author of this book and

<sup>5</sup> Maehler 1974: 308: "There is a blank space after the ω, then a gap for 2–3 letters. One might suggest something like τῷ[ν ὑπ(ομνημάτων), abbreviated ΥΠ] [= Maehler has Y on top of Π; author's note] εἰς Δημοσθένην τὸν ῥήτορ[α τὸ ἄ (exempli gratia), although the blank space after τῷ would be against it." Hengstl 1978, 227: "τῷ[ν ὑπ(ομνημάτων)] bietet sich als Ergänzung an, wenn man nicht in τῷ[ eine Verschreibung sehen will (ω anstatt o ist möglich)."

<sup>6</sup> According to Hengstl 1978. Maehler 1974, has [ ].

<sup>7</sup> Hengstl 1978: 227, adds a reconstruction ("Das Zeilenende τὸ πρῶτον ist beispielhalber ergänzt."). Maehler 1974: 308: "The gap at the end of this line, after ῥήτορ[, may have contained 5–6 letters."

<sup>8</sup> According to Hengstl 1978. Maehler 1974: 306, has [ ]. Further see 308: "There is a blank space before Μενάνδρου."

<sup>9</sup> The English translation follows Maehler 1974: 306. For comments on letter forms, uncertain letters or letter traces, see Maehler 1974: 306–308.



three more titles he obviously requires for a specific purpose. The first book is attributed as τὸ βιβλίον, i.e., with a diminutive form; and this may lead to miniature books from (late) antiquity, their physical features, usages, contents, and, above all, purposes.

## 2. The papyrus letter, ancient rhetors, and τὸ βιβλίον (l. 6)

The papyrus reminder “turns out to be of considerable interest”<sup>10</sup> and “ist in mehrfacher Hinsicht reizvoll”<sup>11</sup> (“is attractive one way and another”) so that a selection of relevant peculiarities are of significance for the present study: sender and addressee are Christians as they are denoted as ἀδελφός (l. 2) and, above all, τῇ σῇ ἀδελφότητι (ll. 6–7). The latter phrase does not occur before the 4th cent. and the phrase and the address does not determine a degree of kinship (“brother”).<sup>12</sup> Another phrase, οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ θεός (l. 8), represents a Christian formula frequently attested in letters from the 3rd cent. onwards.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, the addressee is styled as ἡ σὴ λογιότης, i.e., with an honorary title that is regularly applied to advocates.<sup>14</sup> The term λογιότης is derived from λόγιος, qualifying a person as “learned,” “erudite” and “skilled in words,” “eloquent” or “oracular.”<sup>15</sup> Consequently, λογιότης alludes to Theognostos as a person skilled in words and speeches, i.e., an orator and, as it is used in that specific formula, was an indication that the denominated person is a lawyer. The whole text and the terms used for the two people in the papyrus letter suggest that Victor was a lawyer and an orator, too.<sup>16</sup> The scribe writes in “a practised but inelegant cursive which resembles P.Merton II.95.”<sup>17</sup> In l. 8 he tried to make a correction: first he wrote ἀναγκάζομεθα, corrected εθ to αι, and forgot to obliterate final α. That means Victor proof-read his letter and detected and corrected a mistake; but he erroneously left the final vowel, probably out of uneasiness and not due to a lack of competence.

Victor expresses clearly and concisely what he wants to have and on which occasion Theognostos received the books from him. He might have stayed with

<sup>10</sup> Maehler 1974: 305.

<sup>11</sup> Hengstl 1978: 228.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Maehler 1974: 307. See also Hengstl 1978: 228.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Maehler 1974: 307.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Maehler 1974: 306. Maehler distinguishes between advocates (σκολαστικοί) and *defensores* (ἐκδικοί) and provides a number of documents for reference. SB 12.11084.4 is given as reference for the use of λογιότης as an honorary title in *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden. Supplement 3*, s.v. λογιότης.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. LSJ: s.v. λόγιος i-iii.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Maehler 1974: 308.

<sup>17</sup> Maehler 1974: 305.

his colleague, Theognostos, at Hermopolis on his way to another place. Maehler tentatively refers to Alexandria,<sup>18</sup> but this is far from certain. Be that as it may, Theognostos should hand over the book to the slave Elias (whose second or nickname cannot be reconstructed).<sup>19</sup> This book is determined as the main purpose of the letter because the recto of the papyrus is then full and the rest of the main body is added in a corner of the verso. The book is qualified further by two names:

*Alexander Claudius*: Apparently, he is in urgent, even desperate need of a book that Alexander Claudius has written about a work by Demosthenes. The *Suda* (A 1128) from the 10th cent. distinguishes between Alexander Claudius, called there a sophist, and Alexander Numenius (or, according to the *Suda*, Alexander son of Numenius), a Greek rhetorician from the first half of the 2nd cent.<sup>20</sup> Besides, the *scholia* on Demosthenes mention a certain Alexander among those who commented on the great Athenian statesman and orator.<sup>21</sup> What is known for sure is that an advocate with the name Victor needed his book back again, probably urgently and for practical reasons.

*Demosthenes*: It comes as no surprise that the lawyer Victor owns a copy with text from and comments about Demosthenes and wants to have it back now. Demosthenes (i.e., his rhetoric, style, and orations) was regarded as a role model for contemporaries and generations of authors to follow (cf., for instance, Plut. *Dem.* 3.1, where Plutarch starts to parallel the lives and careers of Cicero and Demosthenes); and, of course, his judicial speeches with their varied topics for various opportunities became famous and were used by lawyers for preparing their own lawsuits.

Having written this, Victor may have realised that he is also in need of other books he has lent Theognostos once and which come to his mind now. He adds Menander's Τεχνή without formulating an adequate phrase to link this to the previous construction. Final ἐν τάχι[ supports the impression that this was a spontaneous idea. Then he turns over his piece of papyrus and writes additional demands to receive two other texts as soon as possible, both by Menander, too; and these are just added by means of καί and supported by repeating the prepositional phrase ἐν τάχι[ expressing his impatience once more.

*Menander*: The three titles required by Victor are rather enigmatic because neither of them is known as such as the work of Menander Rhetor, a Greek rhetorician from Laodicea on the Lycos (not to be confused with Menander, the dramatist). Only two of his works are undoubtedly known today. These are the *Division of Epideictic Styles* (Διαιρέσεις τῶν Ἐπιδεικτικῶν) and *On Epideictic Speeches* (Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν). Neither the Τεχνή nor the Μέθοδοι or Ἐγκώμα

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Maehler 1974: 308.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Maehler 1974: 306.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Maehler 1974: 308.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Scholia Graeca* (Dindorf), xviii and 190–191 (= Κατὰ Φιλίππου Δ 131.1).

are known under such a title. Does one of his treatises on epideictic speeches have to do with Menander's Τεχνή?<sup>22</sup>

Be that as it may, we have the lawyer Victor who requires his copies of a commentary (or *scholia*) of Demosthenes and three works by Menander Rhetor back. In other words, he needs orations by one if not the most admired rhetor with comments by Alexander Claudius and the more theoretical treatises by a rhetorician. So it can be assumed that he had to compose a speech urgently for which a role model and theoretical works would be pivotal. Possibly, he was engaged in a lawsuit and had to write a speech for his client. That could explain why Victor seems to be in a hurry or feels under pressure.<sup>23</sup>

Unfortunately, the letter does not give any hint about how the books by Menander looked like. Victor's notes are unplanned additions that came to his mind spontaneously. The (*scholia* or) commentary on Demosthenes, however, are determined by the term τὸ βιβλίον.<sup>24</sup> Equally to βιβλος the diminutive βιβλίον is derived from βύβλος and denotes "Egyptian papyrus, from whose strips writing material was manufactured"<sup>25</sup> or "the Egyptian papyrus, Cyberus Papyrus."<sup>26</sup> Usually, a diminutive qualifies something as small, i.e., in this context a book as "a little book" or a document as "a short document" (cf. *Matt.* 19.7; *Mark* 10.4). Of course, it was also applied to longer written texts.<sup>27</sup> Besides, it may also tell something about the peculiarity of a book (e.g., a book divided into subdivisions; the place where books were kept; as a plural for "the Scriptures" as in *I Macc.* 12.9). And it was also used synonymously with βιβλος (e.g., a "book of accounts or records") and βιβλίδιον ("petition"). Other diminutives like βιβλάριον and βιβλαρίδιον (and βιβλιδάριον) determine a (document and/or) roll as being "small."<sup>28</sup> These are real diminutives, while βιβλίον could have received a wider range of meanings and might have been substituted by the real diminutives in its function to diminish a codex or roll.<sup>29</sup>

Although a definite diminutive meaning of βιβλίον cannot be proven and might be second choice when the date of the papyrus letter is concerned, it cannot be ruled out that the term could have designated the book as "a small book" (or, less likely, "a short book"). Nonetheless, this is nothing to form a solid basis for a thesis. In addition, for the 5th cent. it is adequate to imagine the book as a codex.

<sup>22</sup> For this and other speculations to identify the three texts see Maehler 1974: 309–310.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Maehler 1974: 310–311.

<sup>24</sup> For further details and references on all the relevant lexemes see the standard lexicons. Further cf. Schrenk 1933; Balz 1980; Kraus 2006: 299–300.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Danker 32000: s.v. βιβλίον.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. LSJ: s.v. βύβλος (and βιβλος), with reference to Herodot. *Hist.* 2.92.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Danker 2000: s.v. βιβλίον (1). Cf. *Luke* 4.17, 20; *Rev.* 6.14; 20.12.

<sup>28</sup> Above all, this is the case in *Rev.* 10.2, 8, 9, in 10.2 v.l. and 10.9 v.l.

<sup>29</sup> So Schrenk 1933: 615.

### 3. Ancient rhetors and miniature books – spot on famous Demosthenes

Even if the term τὸ βιβλίον does probably not determine the size, i.e., the dimensions of the book with Alexander Claudius' commentary on Demosthenes, it indicates that manuscripts (or fragments of them) offer physical features and that their materiality is of significance. It is an appeal to take them as what they are: archaeological artefacts that were produced and used by people. In 1977, Eric G. Turner published his groundbreaking study of the codex, and his categories have been used as standard groups since then. For him the dimensions of the codices (and/or their extant fragments) define the categories he lists. The relevant groups for “small books” are “Group 11 (‘Miniature,’ defined as less than 10 cm. broad)” for papyrus<sup>30</sup> and “XIV Miniature (Breadth Less Than 10 cm.)” for parchment codices.<sup>31</sup> Obviously, these miniature codices formed a rather peculiar but special group of books in (late) antiquity. Years ago I have collected information about approximately ninety Greek miniature books. In 1977 Turner could only take into account nine miniature codices on papyrus and forty-seven on parchment, by far most of them of Christian origin. This and subsequent speculations by Colin H. Roberts<sup>32</sup> in his lectures from the same year prompted scholars to follow to form the assumption that miniature codices were heavily preferred by Christians and even a Christian invention. The database from 2007 and published in a slightly revised form in 2010, though not up to date anymore, proves that such notions are inappropriate and exaggerated because non-Christian miniature codices are mostly ignored. Thus, Turner and Roberts remain the basis for most of the assertions on miniature books by (Christian) scholars even today.<sup>33</sup>

There are twenty-seven (fragments of) manuscripts with classical authors and texts. Among them Demosthenes is the best attested author with five miniature formats followed by Isocrates and Menander (mainly Menander the dramatist), while most other authors (or texts) are only represented once, only Homer twice.<sup>34</sup> A closer look at the five miniature formats with Demosthenes – all of them from Egypt – should help to shed light on the physical/palaeographical features and thereafter on the individual or common practical use of these items. All this should be compared with what is expressed in Victor's papyrus letter/reminder. As delineated above, I have five items with Demosthenes in my conspectus of Greek miniature formats from (late) antiquity but

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Turner 1977: 22 (see also 25).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Turner 1977: 29–30.

<sup>32</sup> See Roberts 1979: 12.

<sup>33</sup> For the criticism and modifications and corrections to such views cf. Kraus 2010: 89–91; Kraus forthcoming (“5: Contextualising the two miniature books of the Rylands Library”).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Kraus 2010: 95–97.

never had time to scrutinise most of them carefully and in detail. What do they look like or, in other words, what do their physical features tell about them? Do they really belong to Turner's groups of miniature codices/formats? What were their actual purposes, how were they used?

### 3.1. Miniature books with Demosthenes put to the test

In the preliminary list of Greek miniature codices from 2007 and 2010 respectively are four (fragments from) codices, while a fifth one is a fragment of a roll. They should be described in more detail in order to find out if they are of miniature format and what physical/palaeographical features they offer:

(1) P.Amh. 2.24 (Leuven Database of Ancient Books [LDAB] 746; TM 59644; Merton-Pack [MP] 0263)<sup>35</sup> is a small parchment fragment 6.3 cm wide and 4.8 cm high. Obviously, it had two columns on the same page. Originally it was approximately 12 cm wide with 26 lines per page. The fragment was cut from the original leaf on the right and the left. It was found somewhere in Egypt, but its exact provenance is unknown.<sup>36</sup> There are breathings, some elision marks, interlinear insertions by the scribe himself, and there is some punctuation. In line 5, recto, a second hand added something above the line later on. The scribe's hand is an impressive biblical majuscule of high quality or, in Grenfell and Hunt's words, an "upright calligraphic"<sup>37</sup> that the piece is dated to the second half of the 4th cent., when the biblical majuscule had reached its height of perfection.<sup>38</sup> The hand leaves a professional and aesthetic impression. Even though the parchment fragment might have been too wide for Turner's group xiv (miniature codices), the extant folio represents a "leaf of a small codex"<sup>39</sup> with Demosthenes, *Epistulae*, 2.1 and 5, and a title.<sup>40</sup>

(2) P.Ant. 2.80 (LDAB 747; TM 59645; MP 0321) is a fragment of a parchment folio with two columns on each page from Antinoopolis. The scribe writes a biblical majuscule with well-formed letters which are rather closely spaced. There are smaller letters near the end of the lines. The ink is brownish and has faded here and there. Usual corrections are made by the scribe ("a surprising

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the detailed study by De Robertis 2015: 161–164 (no. 35).

<sup>36</sup> Grenfell and Hunt write about that (cf. P.Amh. 1v. [preface]) as follows: "[...] the Greek papyri have been bought for Lord Amherst by us at various places in Egypt [...]" They do not add any other information about the provenances of the Amherst papyri in P.Amh. 2 so that there is not more that can be said about the provenance of P.Amh. 2.24.

<sup>37</sup> This is what they write in their *editio princeps* (P.Amh. 2.24).

<sup>38</sup> For more details and images see Cavallo 1967: 64 and pl. 39c.; Cavallo, Maehler 1987: no. 13c (34).

<sup>39</sup> Cavallo, Maehler 1987: no. 13c (34).

<sup>40</sup> Demosthenes' second speech against Philipp is also attested by P.Amh. 2.24 (4th cent. CE), P.Köln 4.183 (3rd cent. CE), P.Hamb. inv. 735v. (2nd cent. CE), P.Oxy. 62.4323 (3rd cent. CE), and 4324 (1st cent. CE). For more information see De Robertis 2015.

number of careless corrections<sup>41</sup>), while others (punctuation, breathings, etc.) were carried out by a second hand. The fragment is dated to the 4th cent. and measures 11.2 x 10.8 cm (wide/high), so that it originally was larger and the page had about 25 lines.<sup>42</sup> Again, a fragment designated as miniature does not really and originally attest to a miniature codex as Turner defined this category. The codex might have had dimensions of 14 x 21 cm.<sup>43</sup> The text preserved is Demosth. *Timocr.* 73–77.

(3) P.Berol. inv. 13274 = Pap.Flor. 4.10 (LDAB 757; TM 59655; MP 0270 + 0271 + 0273) consists of two parchment *bifolia* with text in one column on each page. The first *bifolium* is almost complete, on the second about half of a page is missing. The scribe forms a biblical majuscule “nella fase della decadenza del canone”,<sup>44</sup> employs *dieresis*, middle point, and *paragraphos*. Ruling is still visible and the text is aesthetically arranged with homogeneous line beginnings and endings. The letters appear irregular and inhomogeneous with a tendency of decoration (e.g., *sigma* and *epsilon*). The two parchment *bifolia* stem from a longer codex.<sup>45</sup> The parchment fragments are dated to the (end of the) 5th cent. and were found in Egypt, though their exact provenance is unknown. Images are available online that visualise the awkward format of a codex with pages that are rather high in relation to their width.<sup>46</sup> One page is 8.5 cm wide and 17.5 cm high, i.e., the codex was (more than) twice as high as wide, so that its width may point to Turner’s group xiv (miniature codices). Its extraordinary height, however, qualifies this codex as a member of his group xiii.<sup>47</sup> Be that as it may, this codex may be regarded as miniature or close to miniature because of its narrow (but high) page dimensions. Also extravagant is its aesthetic impression with its ample blank space around the writing, above all with broad top and bottom margins. The parchment *bifolia* preserve passages from three different works by Demosthenes: *De classibus*, 41 (with end title), *Pro Rhodiorum libertate*, 14–16 and 27–28, and *Pro Megalopolitanis*, 9–11, all three with end titles.

(4) P.Berol. inv. 17067 (LDAB 706; TM 59604; MP 0326.01) is a papyrus fragment that is 6.4 cm wide and 3.4 cm high found at Hermopolis (= Hermo-

<sup>41</sup> Barns, Zilliacus 1960, in: P.Ant. 2.68.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Cavallo 1967: 72 and pl. 52a.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Turner 1977: 104 (no. 56).

<sup>44</sup> Orsini 2005: 64. Orsini offers the most detailed palaeographic description (63–64; apart from Hausmann).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Hausmann 1978: 53–67; Orsini 2005: 64.

<sup>46</sup> For the complete set of photographs of all sides of the two *bifolia* see the Photographic Archive of Papyri in the Cairo Museum (<http://ipap.csad.ox.ac.uk/4DLink4/4DACTION/IP-APwebquery?vPub=Pap.Flor.&vVol=4&vNum=10>; last access 10/09/2015). Images of one side of one of the *bifolia* are in Schubart 1921: 125 (no. 26); Turner 1977: xix (no. 8).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Turner 1977: 29; Orsini 2005: 64. Turner’s group xiii only consists of two entries, one of them is the codex under discussion here.

polis Magna).<sup>48</sup> The papyrus is damaged (i.e., broken) at all its sides. The scribe seems to have been a well-trained professional writing in a literary hand that formed rather small if not tiny letters in black ink. The piece is dated to the 3rd cent. Taken for granted that the codex originally had one column only the dimensions of the reconstructed page would have been 10 cm wide and 11 cm high. This is calculated on the assumption of 26 to 28 letters per line and margins of about 1.5 cm. The first editor, William M. Brashear, however, regarded it as more probable that there was a preceding column on the one and a following column on the other page so that the original page dimensions would have been far larger as those of a miniature codex. Consequently, the codex would have had the same or standard dimensions as most of the other codices.<sup>49</sup> The fragment has Demosth. *Aphob.* 60 and *Onet.* 1.

(5) P.Lond.Lit. (or P.Lit.Lond.) 130 + 134 = Brit.Lib. inv. 133 + 134 = Pap. Flor. 8.44 (= LDAB 2431; TM 61289; MP 1234 + 0337) are from a papyrus roll that was acquired in 1889. It seems that P.Lond.Lit. 130 with Demosth. *Ep.* 3, has not been dealt with in detail up to now in contrast to 134 (Hyperides),<sup>50</sup> though it has been described several times.<sup>51</sup> The first part of the roll carries Hyperides, *In Philippidem*, in 9 columns, which occupies a part of the role that is 49.3 cm wide and 24 cm high with columns 4.3 cm wide and 15 cm high and margins with 3.5 cm at the top and 5 cm at the bottom. The script is bilinear (except for  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ ) with rather regular majuscules. Lines tend to begin further to the left one after each other. The part with Hyperides is dated to the 2nd cent. BCE.<sup>52</sup> There is a blank space of about 30.4 cm between the Hyperides and the Demosthenes texts and though P.Lond.Lit. 130 is written by a different scribe, it also ought to be from the same time as the Hyperides text.<sup>53</sup> There are

<sup>48</sup> For full information cf. Brashear 1994: 25–28 and plates 12–13.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Brashear 1994: 25.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Johnson 2004: 320: “*PlondLit* 130 descr. (Demosthenes). This large piece deserves a full reporting, which it has not yet received.”

<sup>51</sup> Cf., for instance, the first edition by Milne 1927: nos. 130 (98) and 134 (100); Kenyon 1871: 42–55 (Hyperides) and 56–62 (Demosthenes) with plates 2–3; Hausmann 1978: 74–97. Further see the useful information provided by the third edition of the Mertens-Pack online database on the pages of Cedopal (<http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/indexanglais.htm>; last access 12/09/2015), no. 337 (the preceding part with Hyperides, *In Philippidem*, is no. 1234). In addition, see now Horváth 2014.

<sup>52</sup> Further palaeographic details about the Hyperides are provided by Cavallo, Maehler 1987: 80 (no. 46); Johnson 2004: 319–320 (+ pl. 15 with a colour image).

<sup>53</sup> This is supported by palaeographical observations and by the fact that the two texts belong to the same roll *and* have a considerably large space in between them. Cf. Kenyon 1891: 56: “The date of the MS. [*P.Lond.Lit.* 130; author’s note] must be contemporary with that of the Hyperides, as so large a space of empty papyrus would not long be preserved unused at the end of the latter; it is therefore probably of the 2nd century B.C.” Consequently, Kraus 2010: 95, with “I v.Chr.–I n.Chr.” must be corrected to “II v.Chr.”.

twelve columns; three more would have been necessary to keep Demosthenes' complete third letter to Philipp.<sup>54</sup> With 17 cm the columns are longer than those of the Hyperides section and consist of 29 to 36 lines with 28 to 30 letters per line. The column width is about 5.7 cm, so that at least this might have prompted the assignment of "miniature" by the LDAB. Nonetheless, the long columns remind of the awkward format of (3) P.Berol. inv. 13274. All in all, Demosth. *Ep.* 3.1–38, covers an area that is 86 cm wide and 24 cm high. The hand is "an extremely small and fine uncial, not so graceful as that of the other text, but very delicate and clear."<sup>55</sup> The text can be read easily in spite of its tininess. There are fewer ligatures than in the Hyperides text and a circumflex marks sense pauses in the text together with a blank space. Of course, the extent of text and, above all the height of the papyrus roll qualify this manuscript as being far from a miniature format, although its column width – also together with the spaces between two columns – would fit Turner's definition, though this was made for codices only. Consequently, if at all, this roll could be compared to a codex like (3) P.Berol. inv. 13274.

### 3.2. *Summary of and conclusions drawn from 3.1.*

As delineated above, with (1) P.Amh. 2.24 and (2) P.Ant. 2.80 two of the five entries for miniature codices with Demosthenes are actually larger than the dimensions given for the category "miniature" by Turner, even if the page dimensions of (2) suggest a rather small format. Another entry, (3) P.Berol. inv. 13274, fits the criterion of having pages less than 10 cm wide, but the extravagant format that originally was twice as high than wide qualifies this small codex as a member of Turner's group xiii and not xiv ("miniature"). Even (4) P.Berol. inv. 17067 does neither necessarily belong to the category of miniature codices nor should it have a legitimate place in a database of Greek miniature codices from late antiquity. The qualification as being "miniature" on LDAB for these four items ought to be corrected or, at least, a qualification without the term "miniature" should be given there (maybe, "rather small" page width), just in case LDAB follows Turner's categories of papyrus and parchment codices.

Equally, the roll (5) P.Lond.Lit. 130 + 134 should not be classified as miniature either. Its column width might be interesting in that respect, above all the mentioned differences between the two sections with Hyperides (P.Lond.Lit. 134) and Demosthenes (P.Lond.Lit. 130), e.g., the column widths, the number of lines, and the hands. The height of 24 cm, however, does not permit to call this item a "miniature" roll. In comparison with other rolls of actual miniature

<sup>54</sup> For further information see De Robertis 2015. De Robertis deals with the seven papyrus codices (P.Oxy. 62.4310; P.Berol. inv. 21280; P.Wash.Univ. 2.66; P.Oxy. 62.4323; P.Rain.Cent. 21; P.Laur. 4.135, and P.Oxy. 62.4326) and the four parchment codices (P.Gen. 3; PSI 2.129; P.Amh. 2.24; P.Mich. inv. 918).

<sup>55</sup> Kenyon 1891: 56.



or small format, P.Lond.Lit. 130+134 apparently represents a fairly usual format. A few example cases should be sufficient here: (a) 11QPsApa (= 11Q11), a parchment roll from cave eleven around Qumran, presents Hebrew *Ps.* 91 (= *Ps.* 90 according to the Septuagint) together with three other hymn- or psalm-like texts. The unopened and damaged roll is 8.5 cm high and 3.5 cm wide. When opened the parchment measures 73 cm and must originally have been 9.5 cm high.<sup>56</sup> (b) P.Berol. inv.10562 + 10571 = BKT V 1/BKT V 2 (LDAB 212, TM 59117, MP 1598), a papyrus roll of the 1st cent. CE with epigrams (some from the *Anthologia palatina*) that is between 4 to 5 cm high according to its present state (but remains of the top and bottom margin are preserved). (c) P.Lond.Lit. (or P.Lit.Lond.) 44 = P.Oxy. 4.659 (LDAB 3742, TM 62560, MP 1371), a papyrus roll of the 1st cent. BCE with five columns from two texts by Pindar is 12.8 cm high and 49 cm wide and, thus, at least a roll of small format.<sup>57</sup> (d) P.Lond.Lit. 96 = P.Egerton 1 (LDAB 1164, TM 60050, MP 0485 + 1877), “a papyrus roll of small format (height 120 mm, including upper margin 20 mm, lower 25 mm.)”<sup>58</sup> with Herodas (Herondas), *Mimiambi* (with marginalia) dated to the 1st or 2nd cent. CE, possibly to the time around 100. (e) P.Oxy. 54.3723, a papyrus roll from the 2nd cent. CE with two columns of elegiacs<sup>59</sup> written on the verso of a document. This roll is only 7.6 cm high with a column height of circa 5.5 cm.

All in all, rolls of small dimensions, i.e., of small height must be checked in detail to figure out whether they may be “miniature” or just small or even of common format. The LDAB provides a considerable number of rolls denominated as “miniature.” Be that as it may, it must not be forgotten that there are significant differences between rolls and codices when it comes to talk about their practical use and handling and their dimensions. The width of columns is interesting, but it is only partly comparable to columns widths of codices. In single codices the page dimensions with full margins are something else than the column height and width of a roll, where the column shares left and right margins with other columns.<sup>60</sup> But the comparison between rolls and codices is a special topic that cannot be dealt with *in extenso* here.

<sup>56</sup> In addition, its text of *Ps.* 91(90) – in comparison with the Masoretic psalm and the Septuagint version – offers interesting parallels and differences. But this must be researched into thoroughly in the future, also together with the Syriac and Latin versions. For some preliminary results see Kraus 2011: 58–61.

<sup>57</sup> See Cavallo, Maehler 1987: 126–128 (no. 84). Another text on the papyrus roll is P.Lond.Lit. 61 = P.Oxy. 4.662 with an anthology (Leonidas, Antipater Sidonius, Amyntas, *Anthologia palatina*).

<sup>58</sup> Turner 1987: no. 39. Further see Kenyon 1891: 1–41.

<sup>59</sup> Maybe, a love elegy; perhaps, elegiacs on Antinous. Cf. the *editio princeps*.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Kraus 2010: 107, and the very helpful reflections by Johnson 2004: 86: “The codex page has no true counterpart in the roll. The physical presence of the page, with its block of text surrounded by upper, lower, and side margins, cannot be paralleled in the roll, where upper

What is for sure is that on the basis of the palaeographical details of potential miniature formats with Demosthenes, my database of miniature codices/rolls requires urgent inspection *and* rectification. Moreover, Turner's categories must be applied with care in the future. Even though some fragments might have been "less than 10 cm. Broad"<sup>61</sup> or have had a "Breadth Less Than 10 cm,"<sup>62</sup> which certainly implies smallness at first glance, their height is also a considerable criterion for judging a manuscript. Its handiness and portability depends on both measures, width and height. Just imagine to put (4) P.Berol. inv. 17067 – on the assumption of page dimensions of 10 x 11 cm – into a bag or a pocket, which could work but might not be that easy, or (3) P.Berol. inv. 13274 = Pap.Flor. 4.10 that was 8.5 cm wide but 17.5 cm high, whose height might make it rather difficult to store it away while travelling.

Nonetheless, (1) P.Amh. 2.24 and (2) P.Ant. 2.80 (and possibly [3] P.Berol. inv. 17067) are at least rather small, neat, and handy in comparison with codices of more common page dimensions; and this handiness, flexibility, and portability fits both (a) the purpose of a miniature codex, no matter which precise width and height it might have had originally, and (b) Demosthenes' orations as rhetorical role models and reference texts for training and preparing for specific occasions and for memorizing polished and concise phrases and passages on the go. So, Demosthenes, all in all widely attested by manuscripts and fragments and absolutely popular with contemporaries and generations to follow,<sup>63</sup> was obviously perfect for such purposes, too. Above all, the Demosthenes manuscripts would perfectly suit the purpose described for the papyrus letter P.Berol. 21849 = SB 12.11084 = C.Pap.Hengstl 91. All these (fragments from) codices and even the roll could have been used for preparing a speech for a lawsuit or a similar occasion.

In addition, a closer look at rolls of considerable small format, i.e., small height (and some with narrow columns), shows that these are older than the bulk of miniature codices. Could it be possible that the "miniature" rolls served as forerunner of "miniature" codices? Might it be possible that Christians here preferred the miniature format as something new (but cf. miniature codices with classical texts and authors aside those of Christian origin) and, thus, were exclusively in favour of this invention, regarding it as the future model of small books? Of course, this remains pure speculation. But such reflections require much more

---

and lower margins are continuous and where the intercolumn belongs to no single column but (excepting start and end) to two [...]. But we must leave behind the image of a notional 'page' consisting of a written column plus the surrounding margins, for that makes no sense in the context of the roll [...]. Nor does it make sense to import from codex culture notions of book production."

<sup>61</sup> Turner 1977: 22 and 25.

<sup>62</sup> Turner 1977: 29–30.

<sup>63</sup> See, for instance, Hausmann 1978; De Robertis 2015.

time and concentration on the mostly palaeographic features of the relevant manuscripts.

#### 4. Miniature codices as representatives of Graeco-Roman book culture in Egypt?

Interestingly, all the manuscripts dealt with previously are from Egypt. It is a pity that for (1) P.Amh. 2.24, (3) P.Berol. inv. 13274 = Pap.Flor. 4.10, and (5) P.Lond. Lit. 130 + 134 exact provenances are not known. It is for sure that all three are from Egypt, as (1) was obviously purchased somewhere in Egypt by Grenfell and Hunt for Lord Amherst's collection, (3) came from Egypt to Berlin, and there is no reason to doubt that, and (5), acquired "in 1889,"<sup>64</sup> was found in Egypt, too.<sup>65</sup> Therefore, the manuscripts may tell something about book production, the use *and* purpose of books in Egypt. With Hermopolis (= Hermopolis Magna; Ἡρμού πόλις μεγάλη) as the provenance of (4) P.Berol. inv. 17067 and the papyrus letter discussed in the introduction to this study (P.Berol. 21849 = SB 12.11084 = C. Pap.Hengstl 91) and Antinoopolis (Ἀντινόου πόλις) as the location of (2) P.Ant. 2.80, conclusions about books may even be narrowed down geographically to a certain region.<sup>66</sup>

At least we get a glimpse of how books looked like in late antiquity on the basis of the fragments discussed here. Unfortunately, we can only speculate about the binding and the exact look of the codices.<sup>67</sup> What can be derived from the palaeographical features of the three parchment and two papyrus fragment, i.e., the four codices and the roll respectively is that they were produced with some care. That does not necessarily mean that their material was of first class, nor does this refer to the potential making of the book/roll itself. All five items present scribes who formed letters of considerable quality and aesthetic impression. For (1) P.Amh. 2.24, (2) P.Ant. 2.80, and (3) P.Berol. inv. 13274 = Pap.

<sup>64</sup> Milne 1927: 98.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Kenyon 1891: 45: "[...] and in this case we gain a not inconsiderable specimen of the style and language of the orator [= Hyperides; author's note] who [...] was apparently hopelessly and entirely lost to the knowledge of the modern world, until, less than half a century ago, he began to be given back to us from the tombs of Egypt." Nevertheless, the bulk of papyri found in the major places were unearthed from rubbish mounds. Cf. Luijendijk 2012.

<sup>66</sup> Hermopolis Magna is the capital of the fifteenth Upper Egyptian nome, the Hare nome in the Heptanomis, roughly in the middle of the north-south expansion and on the west bank of the Nile. Antinoopolis is a Roman city on the east bank of the Nile, just opposite Hermopolis Magna. For specific literature see Rupprecht 1994: 38, 168 (Hermopolis Magna), 68–69 (Antinoopolis).

<sup>67</sup> But see, for instance, P.Ryl. 1.28 (a papyrus booklet or miniature codex with a text dealing with palmomancy) that offers very interesting clues about binding and handling. Cf. Kraus 2017: section 4.

Flor. 4.10 the scribes' hands are described as biblical majuscules with corrections by the scribe for (1) and (2) – that implies some sort of proof-reading – and a tendency of decoration at some letters for (3). For all of them the quality of writing is stressed (e.g., an “upright calligraphic” for P.Amh. 2.24), though there are some rather careless corrections in (2). The literary hand of (4) P.Berol. inv. 17067 appears to belong to a well-trained professional who was capable to produce a text of a remarkable aesthetic impression at a substantial speed. The two hands of (5) P.Lond.Lit. 130 + 134 = Pap.Flor. 8.44 are different from each other but both are of good quality. While the Hyperides is written in a regular majuscules, the Demosthenes appears to be less aesthetic but of equal quality with its tiny and fine letters, which can be read without any difficulty.

In addition, the columns of the five items with Demosthenes are arranged with care to provide a harmonious impression with a tendency of homogenous line endings and beginnings. So all five manuscripts make a very good impression as far as letter forms (scribes' hands), layout, column arrangement, and even the reliability and accuracy of the text from Demosthenes are concerned. Apparently, it was regarded as significant to have manuscripts with Demosthenes available that satisfied a certain expectation of quality and readability. These manuscripts may all serve the purpose indicated or implied by Victor's letter to Theognostos (P.Berol. 21849 = SB 12.11084 = C.Pap.Hengstl 91). All these may have suited the lending of Demosthenes for the purpose of copying *and* personal or even professional use, though a different way of handling must be considered for the roll of noticeable dimensions with Hyperides and Demosthenes.

Eventually, it is imperative to stress that the places the remains of the three parchment and two papyrus manuscripts were found need not be the production site of the codices and the roll. They could have been produced/written somewhere else, brought to, for instance, Hermopolis and Antinoopolis, and were discarded there. Herwig Maehler's inspirational idea of Victor lending books to his companion Theognostos in Hermopolis on his way to Alexandria is plausible, though it will remain speculation. Such a scenario does not necessarily depend on miniature codices (or rolls); the smallness of a manuscript does not play an important role here because the school master's slave Elias was just only sent to bring the lent books back to Victor, wherever this Victor actually lived. So, Elias should have been prepared to carry and transport the required books, even if they were of common or standard size.

Altogether, this study terminates with conclusions drawn from forms of books – i.e., codices and a roll – with texts by Demosthenes which are not of miniature format and should be deleted in a database that focusses on miniature codices according to Turner's established typology and definition. The lending of books as it is depicted in a papyrus letter from Victor to Theognostos dated to the second half of the 5th cent. does not explicitly refer to small books. Furthermore, the diminutive τὸ βιβλίον is not a designation of the lent book as being

small or miniature. But letter and diminutive help to determine the purpose and use of books with Demosthenes in (late) antiquity in Hermopolis Magna and Antinoopolis and – if it is taken for granted that manuscripts need not be manufactured and principally used in the place they were actually found – in every major and significant place of Graeco-Roman Egypt. All these observations depend on scrutinizing research on papyri (i.e., this term includes parchment and other materials as well) as archaeological objects; and results like these are only possible if (fragments of) manuscripts are respected in their whole integrity or, in other words, if their physical features, their palaeography, are respected and taken seriously.

## Bibliography

- Balz, Horst. “βιβλίον, οὐ, τό.” *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1 (1980): 522–524.
- Barns, John W.B., Henric Zilliacus. *The Antinoopolis Papyri. Part II*. Graeco-Roman Memoirs 37. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1960.
- Brashear, William M. “P. Berol. 17067. Demosthenes 29.60: Contra Aphobum; 30.1: Contra Onetorem.” *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 40 (1994): 25–28 (plates 12–13).
- Cavallo, Guglielmo, Herwig Maehler. *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period A.D. 300–800*. Supplement of the Bulletin of Institute of Classical Studies 47. London: University of London, 1987.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo. *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica*. Studi e testi di papirologia 2. Florence: Le Monnier, 1967.
- Danker, Frederick William. *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Based on Walter Bauer’s *Wörterbuch*. 3rd Edition. Chicago–London: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- De Robertis, Francesca. *Per la storia del testo di Demostene. I papiri delle Filippiche*. Paradossis 22. Bari: Dedalo, 2015.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm (Ed.). *Scholia Graeca ex codicibus et emendata*. Demosthenes ex recensione Guilelmi Dindorf 8. Oxford: E typographeo academico, 1851.
- Hausmann, Bernhard. *Demosthenis fragmenta in papyris et membranis servata (pars prima)*. *Papyrologica Florentina* IV. Florence: Gonelli, 1978 (reprint of Diss. Leipzig 1921).
- Hengstl, Joachim. *Griechische Papyri aus Ägypten als Zeugnisse des öffentlichen und privaten Lebens*. Griechisch-deutsch. Sammlung Tusculum. München: Heimeran, 1978.
- Horváth, László. *Der “neue Hypereides”*. Textedition, Studien und Erläuterung. Berlin–München–Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2014.
- Johnson, William A. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, Including the Newly Discovered Poems by Herodas*. London: Trustees, 1891.
- Kraus, Thomas J. ““Knowing Letters”. (II)Literacy, Books, and Literary Concept in the *Life and Miracles of Saint Thecla* (Mir. Thcl. 45).” *Annali di storia dell’esegesi* 23 (2006): 283–308.
- Kraus, Thomas J. “Die Welt der Miniaturbücher in der Antike und Spätantike. *Prolegomena* und erste methodische Annäherungen für eine Datensammlung.” *Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* 35 (2010): 79–110.

- Kraus, Thomas J. "Translating the Septuagint Psalms – Some 'Lese Früchte' and Their Value for an Analysis of the Rhetoric (and Style) of the Septuagint (Psalms)." Pages 49–68 in *Et sapienter et eloquenter. Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint*. Edited by J. Thomas Kraus, Eberhard Bons. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 241. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Kraus, Thomas J. "Small in Size, but Fabulous Artefacts: *P.Ryl.* III 463, *P.Ryl.* I 28, and Late Antique Miniature Books." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, forthcoming.
- Luijendijk, AnneMarie. "Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus." *Vigiliae Christianae* 64 (2012): 217–254.
- Maehler, Herwig. "Menander Rhetor and Alexander Claudius in a Papyrus Letter." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 15 (1974): 305–311.
- Milne, Harold I.M. *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*. London: Printed by Order of the Trustees, 1927.
- Orsini, Pasquale. *Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica. Materiali per un aggiornamento*. Studi archeologici, artistici, filologici, letterari e storici 7. Cassino: Università degli Studi di Cassino, 2005.
- Roberts, Colin H. *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. The Schweich Lectures 1977. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Rupprecht, Hans-Albert. *Kleine Einführung in die Papyrskunde*. Die Altertumswissenschaft. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994.
- Schrenk, Gottlob. "βίβλος, βιβλίον." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1 (1933): 613–620.
- Schubart, Wilhelm. *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern. Handbücher der staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*. 2nd Edition. Berlin–Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1921.
- Turner, Eric G. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. Supplement to Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies 46. 2nd Edition Revised and Enlarged by Peter J. Parsons. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987.
- Turner, Eric G. *The Typology of the Early Codex*. Haney Foundation Series 18. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia, 1977.
- Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden. Supplement 3 (1977–1988)*. Edited by Hans-Albert Rupprecht, Andrea Jördens. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.